

37. (Amended) A method for reporting events in a wireless intelligent network, said method comprises the steps of:

- identifying a group associated with a wireless subscriber when an event is detected;
- determining a directory number from a table that includes one or more predetermined directory numbers indexed by event identifiers that are each associated with an event and group identifiers that are each associated with a subscriber group; and
- reporting to a subscriber attempting to communicate with the wireless subscriber, a message associated with the determined directory number.

#### REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 23, 2002, the Examiner objected to claim 22; rejected claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20-29, 31, 33-35, 37-44, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wheeler, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,583,920); rejected claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gallant (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,782); rejected claims 14, 32, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler, Jr. in view of Henderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,363); rejected claims 9, 30, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler, Jr. in view of Garcia (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,429); and rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant in view of Wheeler, Jr.

By this amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 7, 23, 34, 35, 36, and 42 without prejudice or disclaimer, and amended claims 1, 11, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 33, and 37. Based on these amendments and the following arguments, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Regarding the objection to claim 22, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position that the processor recited in this claim is included in the memory. Applicant directs the Examiner to the plain language of the claim. As presented, claim 22 recites a wireless switching node, comprising a memory (including a structure *and* computer-readable code) and a processor. Thus, the memory does not include the processor, but rather the wireless switching node includes the processor. However, to remove any possible ambiguities associated with the interpretation of the elements included in claim 22, Applicant has reformatted the body of this claim by indenting the structure and computer-readable code elements. Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicant requests that the objection to this claim be withdrawn.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20-29, 31, 33-35, 37-44, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because Wheeler, Jr. does not teach each and every step and/or element of these claims.

Wheeler, Jr. discloses an intelligent network system that allows messages to be presented to a caller based on particular services available to the caller or a called entity. The system allows a Service Switching Point (SSP) to query an Integrated Service Control Point (ISCP) based on a determined trigger associated with a call (e.g., blocked call). The ISCP uses the query to access a table to translate information in the

query into instructions for the SSP. The ISCP then sends a message back to the SSP that instructs the SSP to route the call to an Intelligent Peripheral (IP). The IP formulates a query message that is sent to the ISCP. Based on the query message from the IP, the ISCP formulates and provides instructions back to the IP. The IP performs an appropriate call processing function specified in the received instructions (see Wheeler, Jr., col. 30, line 16 to col. 31, line 43).

In contrast, claim 1 includes a combination of steps including, among other things, determining a directory number associated with an identified group and a detected event, establishing a call between a wireless subscriber and a message node in the network using the determined directory number, generating a message by the message node based on the directory number and a profile associated with the identified group, and reporting the message to the wireless subscriber. The instructions provided by the ISCP to the IP, as described by Wheeler, Jr., are not the same as the directory number recited in claim 1. Instead, the ISCP instructions provide information that the IP uses to determine a type of call processing function to perform. For instance, the ISCP instructions may direct the IP to request a PIN from a caller attempting to reach a subscriber. The directory number included in claim 1 is used to establish a call between the wireless subscriber and a message node that generates the message reported to the wireless subscriber. Accordingly, without the directory number, the call to the message node would not be established.

Further, the directory number recited in claim 1 is also associated with an identified group that has a profile. The message generated by the message node is based on at least this profile. Accordingly, there is a correlation between the directory

number and the message generated by the message node and reported to the subscriber. In contrast, Wheeler, Jr. discloses that the original instructions that are sent from the ISCP to the IP are not associated with any messages provided by the IP. Instead, the original instructions enable the IP to route messages to a subscriber (see Wheeler, Jr., col. 31, lines 7-18). Wheeler, Jr. requires that the IP request additional instructions from the ISCP to determine the type of call processing (e.g., message) that the IP is to perform (see Wheeler, Jr., col. 31, lines 22-35). Accordingly, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach a directory number associated with an identified group and detected event that is used to not only establish a call between a subscriber and a message node, but also is used to generate a message reported to the subscriber. Accordingly, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach at least the determining, establishing, and generating steps, as recited in claim 1.

Because Wheeler, Jr. does not teach every step included in claim 1, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-6 and 8-10 depend from claim 1. As explained, claim 1 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claims 2-6 and 8-10 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 1. Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach retrieving a group identifier associated with the calling wireless subscriber from a subscriber services database in the network, as recited in claim 5. Instead, Wheeler, Jr. describes triggers that are set up to

effectuate particular AIN services. There is no discussion or suggestion in this reference regarding group identifiers associated with a calling wireless subscriber. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Moreover, Wheeler, Jr. fails to teach selecting the directory number from a table that includes one or more predetermined directory numbers indexed by event identifiers and group identifiers, as recited in claim 6. The tables used by the ISCP of Wheeler, Jr., do not include directory numbers, much less directory numbers that are indexed by event identifiers and group identifiers. In fact, Wheeler, Jr. does not even suggest, nor has the Examiner identified, indices that are used in the SCP databases and identifiers associated with any events and subscriber groups. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 11 includes recitations similar to those included in claim 1. Accordingly, because claim 1 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr., claim 11 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 1. For example, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach directory numbers that direct calls to a message node that selects one or more messages that are provided to a subscriber based on the directory numbers, as recited in claim 11. As explained above with respect to claim 1, the instructions provided by the ISCP to the IP, as described by Wheeler, Jr., are not the same as the directory numbers recited in claim 11. Instead, the ISCP instructions provide information that the IP uses to determine a type of call processing function to perform. Accordingly, because Wheeler, Jr. does not teach, at least the associating,

storing and establishing steps of claim 11, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 11. Accordingly, because claim 11 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr., claims 13-16 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 11. Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 20 includes recitations similar to those included in claim 1. Accordingly, because claim 1 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr., claim 20 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 1. For example, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach the step of selecting a directory number based on an identified group and a detected event, as recited in claim 20. Further, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach the step of sending the selected directory number to a switching node such that a call is established from a subscriber and a message node to allow the message node to provide a message that is selected based on the directory number and a profile associated with the identified group, as recited in claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 12(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 21 depends from claim 20. As explained, claim 20 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claim 21 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 20, and Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Additionally, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach a wireless switching node that includes a memory structure including a trigger indexed by variable number of digits in a directory number of a first subscriber, as recited in claim 22. Although the triggers taught by Wheeler, Jr. may be set as a destination number, the reference does not teach or even suggest a trigger indexed by digits of a directory number. In fact, Wheeler, Jr. does not even mention indexing the triggers (see Wheeler, Jr., col. 30, lines 15-35, cited by the Examiner). Accordingly, Wheeler, Jr. cannot teach the recitations of claim 22, and Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 22. As explained, claim 22 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claims 24 and 25 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 22, and Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 26, 27, and 33 include recitations similar to those included in claim 1. As explained, claim 1 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claims 26, 27, and 33 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 1. For example, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach selecting a directory number based on a detected event and an identified group that is used to establish communications between a subscriber and a message node and is used by the message node to select a message to be sent to the subscriber, as recited in claim 26. Further, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach selecting or providing a message based on profiles corresponding to groups associated with subscribers, as recited in claims 27 and 33, respectively. As

previously noted, Wheeler, Jr. discloses a network system that provides messages based on instructions received from an ISCP device. The IP disclosed by the Wheeler, Jr. does not select messages based on any type of profile. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 28, 29, and 31 depend from claim 27. As explained, claim 27 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claims 28, 29, and 31 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 27, and Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach determining a directory number from a table that includes one or more predetermined directory numbers indexed by event and group identifiers and reporting a message associated with the directory number, as recited in claim 37. Although Wheeler, Jr. discloses a table that is accessed by the ISCP, the accessing is performed to formulate instructions used by the IP to perform call processing functions. There is nothing in the reference that discloses a table including directory numbers, much less directory numbers that are indexed by any information, such as event and group identifiers, as recited in claim 37. Accordingly, because Wheeler, Jr. does not teach, at least the identifying, determining, and reporting steps of claim 37, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 38-41, 43, 44, and 46 depend from claim 37. As explained, claim 37 is distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claims 38-41, 43, 44, and 46 are also



distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 37, and Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because Gallant does not teach each and every step and/or element of these claims.

Gallant teaches a communications network that implements a database management system that uses mechanisms for providing response messages to wireless and wireline callers based on particular routing instructions.

In contrast, claim 17 includes a combination of steps including, among other things, receiving, at the switching node, a directory number from the identified location register and establishing the call from a wireline subscriber to the message node using the received directory number when an event associated with the call is detected. Contrary to the Examiner's position, the voice mailbox capability 124 disclosed by Gallant is not a message node that has a call established between a wireline subscriber using a directory number received by a switching node. Instead, the mailbox capability 124 is a mechanism that is included in wireline switch 120 that allows a subscriber to manipulate certain messages and receive calls. This is not a message node that is interconnected with a switching node by a network, as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17. As explained, claim 17 is distinguishable from Gallant. Accordingly, claims 18 and 19 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 17, and Applicant

requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 14 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because neither Wheeler, Jr. or Henderson et al., alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recitations of these claims.

Claims 14 and 32 depend on claims 11 and 27, respectively. As explained, claims 11 and 27 are distinguishable from Gallant. Accordingly, claims 14 and 32 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claims 11 and 27. For example, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach or suggest directory numbers that direct calls to a message node that selects one or more messages that are provided to a subscriber based on the directory numbers, as recited in claim 11. Also, Wheeler, Jr. does not teach or suggest selecting or providing a message based on profiles corresponding to groups associated with subscribers, as recited in claims 27. Henderson et al. does not make up for these deficiencies of Wheeler, Jr. Instead, Henderson et al. teaches an automated customer service network system that performs a language check to determine what language to play in a voice prompt (see Henderson et al., col. 13, lines 37-52). Accordingly, because neither of these references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recitations of claims 14 and 32, Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 14 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because neither Wheeler, Jr. or Garcia, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recitations of these claims.

Claims 9, 30, and 45 depend on claims 1, 27, and 37, respectively. As explained, claims 1, 27, and 37 are distinguishable from Wheeler, Jr. Accordingly, claims 9, 30, and 35 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claims 1, 27, and 37. Garcia does not make up for the deficiencies of Wheeler, Jr. Instead, Garcia teaches an automated telephony system that provides information relating to a patient in response to audio communications from a caller. Garcia does not teach directory numbers, as used in claims 9, 30, and 45. Accordingly, because neither of these references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recitations of claims 9, 30, and 45, Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Regarding claim 18, Applicant notes that the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gallant. In that rejection, The Examiner asserts that “the call [taught by Gallant] is inherently terminated when the wireline subscriber places the phone on-hook” (see Office Action, page 11, lines 4-5).

The Examiner also rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant in view of Wheeler, Jr. In that rejection, the Examiner asserts that Gallant “does not disclose terminating the call established [from] the wireline subscriber to the message node when a request for disconnect is received from the message node” (see Office Action, page 13, paragraph 8).

Accordingly, it is unclear to Applicant the Examiner’s position with respect to the recitations of claim 18 and the teachings of Gallant. That is, the Examiner asserts that Gallant teaches the recitations of claim 18 and then takes the position that the reference does not teach the same recitations. Accordingly, Applicant requests clarification of the

Examiner's position regarding claim 18 in the Examiner's next communication to Applicant.

Regarding the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), this claim depends from claim 17. As explained, claim 17 is distinguishable from Gallant. Accordingly, claim 18 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reason set forth for claim 17. Further, Wheeler, Jr. does not make up for the deficiencies of Gallant. Accordingly, because Wheeler, Jr. and Gallant, alone or in combination, teach the recitations of claims 17 and/or 18, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 07-2339.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/22/2003

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.  
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01  
Irving, TX 75038  
(781) 466-2220

By: James K. Weixel  
James K. Weixel  
Reg. No. 44,399

**APPENDIX TO CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

Please cancel claims 7, 23, 34, 35, 36, and 42 without prejudice or disclaimer and amend claims 1, 11, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 33, and 37 as indicated in the attached Appendix and presented below.

1. (Amended) A method for reporting events in a wireless intelligent network, said method comprises the steps of:

identifying a group associated with a wireless subscriber when an event is detected; (S10)

determining a directory number associated with the identified group and the detected event; [and] (S9)

establishing a call between the wireless subscriber and a message node in the network using the determined directory number;

(S10) generating a message by the message node based on the directory number and a profile associated with the identified group; and (S10)

reporting the message to the wireless subscriber [a message associated with the determined directory number].

11. (Amended) A method for reporting events associated with calls requested by wireless subscribers in a wireless intelligent network, wherein the wireless subscribers are members of subscriber groups, said method comprises the steps of:

associating one or more directory numbers with the events and the subscriber groups;

storing, in a message node in the network, messages corresponding to the associated directory numbers, respectively; [and]

establishing calls, when the network detects the events, between [to] the message node a subscriber based on the directory numbers, [when the network detects the events] wherein the message node selects one or more messages that are provided to a subscriber based on the directory numbers and the associated subscriber group.

17. (Amended) A method for reporting events in a wireless intelligent network comprising a switching node and a message node interconnected by a network, said method comprises the steps of:

receiving, at the switching node, a request for establishing a call from a wireline subscriber to a wireless subscriber in the wireless intelligent network;

identifying a location register in the wireless intelligent network for routing the call;

receiving, at the switching node, a directory number from the identified location register [a directory number]; and

establishing the call from the wireline subscriber to the message node using the received directory number when an event associated with the call is detected.

20. (Amended) A method for reporting events in a wireless network comprising a switching node, a location register, and a message node, said method comprises the steps of:

receiving, at the location register, a request from the switching node for routing a call from a first subscriber to a second subscriber in the wireless network;

identifying a group associated with the first subscriber when an event associated with the call is detected;

selecting a directory number based on the identified group and the detected event; and

sending the selected directory number to the switching node such that the call is established from the first subscriber to the message node to allow the message node to provide to the first subscriber a message that is selected based on the directory number and a profile associated with the identified group.

22. (Amended) A wireless switching node, comprising:

a memory including:

a structure for identifying a location register in a wireless network when the switching node receives a request for establishing a call from a first subscriber to a second subscriber in the wireless network, wherein the structure includes a trigger indexed by a variable number of digits in a directory number of the first subscriber; and

computer-readable code for establishing the call from the first subscriber to a message node in the wireless network when an event associated with the call is detected; and  
a processor for executing the computer-readable code.

24. (Amended) The wireless switching node of claim 22, wherein the structure includes a trigger indexed by an area code in [a] the directory number of the first subscriber.

25. (Amended) The wireless switching node of claim 22, wherein the structure includes a trigger indexed by an area code and an office code in [a] the directory number of the first subscriber

26. (Amended) A location register, comprising:  
a memory including:

a structure for storing predetermined directory numbers associated with events and groups in a wireless intelligent network, wherein the predetermined directory numbers correspond, respectively, to messages stored in a message node in the wireless intelligent network; and

computer-readable code for detecting at least one of the events when one subscriber requests a call to another subscriber<sub>1</sub> [and for ]identifying a group associated with the one subscriber requesting the call<sub>1</sub> and [for] selecting, based on the detected event and the identified group, one of the stored predetermined directory numbers



[based on the detected event and the identified group] that is used to establish communications between the one subscriber and the message node and is used by the message node to select one of the messages to be sent to the one subscriber; and  
a processor for executing the computer-readable code.

27. (Amended) A message node, comprising:

a storage module for storing messages associated, respectively, with predetermined directory numbers that correspond to events in a wireless intelligent network and correspond to groups with profiles associated with wireless subscribers;

a memory including computer-readable code for selecting [playing] one of the messages based on the profiles when the wireless intelligent network detects at least one of the events, [and] [establishes] establishing a call to one of the predetermined directory numbers, and providing the selected message to a subscriber associated with the one predetermined directory number; and

a processor for executing the computer-readable code.

33. (Amended) A computer-readable medium capable of configuring a computer to perform a method for reporting events in a wireless intelligent network, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for establishing a call from a first subscriber to a second subscriber in the wireless intelligent network;

requesting a route from a location register in the network;

receiving from the location register a directory number; [and]

establishing the call from the first subscriber to a message node in the wireless intelligent network using the received directory number when an event associated with the call is detected; and

providing a message to the first subscriber based on the directory number and a profile associated with the subscriber.

37. (Amended) A method for reporting events in a wireless intelligent network, said method comprises the steps of:

identifying a group associated with a wireless subscriber when an event is detected;

[determining a directory number associated with the identified group and the detected event] determining a directory number from a table that includes one or more predetermined directory numbers indexed by event identifiers that are each associated with an event and group identifiers that are each associated with a subscriber group;  
and

reporting to a subscriber attempting to communicate with the wireless subscriber, a message associated with the determined directory number.